DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 210 624 CS 006 354

AUTHOR Frankel, Alan D.
TITLE Structuring an Adult Learning Environment. Part II: Teaching Versus Tutoring the Support Services.
PUB DATE Nov 81
NOTE 13p.; Paper presented at the Fall Meeting of the New York College Learning Skills Association (Grossinger, NY, November 1-4, 1981). For related document see ED 199 658.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adult Students; Higher Education; *Peer Teaching; Remedial Instruction; Remedial Reading; Student Motivation; Student Needs; *Teacher Role; *Tutoring; *Tutors

ABSTRACT

The college tutor's job is often one of clarifying and reinterpreting material already presented. It is important to highlight the point that the tutor is not teaching--teaching has already taken place. Rather, the tutor is addressing a singular need and is clarifying and rephrasing for the student, which is a talent separate and distinct from teaching. The tutor cannot give work outside of the hour conference unless the student is committed enough to assume extra responsibility. For this reason, the tutor should meet weekly with academic advisors and instructional staff. Here, the tutor may provide the teacher with a better route to reach the student, who often views the tutor in a more positive light than the teacher. While a teacher must work hard to achieve a student's trust, the tutor has an easier time of gaining a bond of rapport with the student because he or she is seen as being more like the student. Singular needs often cannot be addressed in the classroom by the teacher. For this reason, too, the tutor is needed. What may seem trivial to the student and, therefore, not worthy of being asked within the classroom may now be comfortably brought to light, questioned, and tested. Although the instructor and tutor are seen differently by students, their jobs are complementary and thus more efficiently carried out when they work with each other. (HOD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED210624

STRUCTURING AN ADULT LEARNING ENVIRONMENT

PART II: TEACHING VERSUS TUTORING THE SUPPORT SERVICES

Alan D. Frankel
Reading Specialist
College Oportunity Program
Mercy College

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Alan D. Frankel

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CS006354

While structuring an adult learning environment, it is necessary to consider the process of teaching and learning. The end-product of the former is communication and student learning; the end-product of the latter is utilization of information. Although the teacher can diagnose, attempt to remediate, and plan a future educational package, the student must be considered as an active participant in the process.

This principle of andragogy is elaborated upon by Kidd (1975) and was detailed as to its implementation by Frankel and Lindsey (1981). To briefly summarize, it was said that the student must be seen as an autonomous individual who, as such, learns best while taking an active, rather than passive, part in curriculum development. The student was pictured as having long-term and short term goals that seemed contradictory at times, but when laid on a matrice that pointed toward graduation these goals were seen as overlapping and having slight differences in order to accommodate each other. For example, it might be necessary to take one or two extra courses to get the Associate's Degree, even if the Baccalaurate was temporarily delayed.

Even though the student is seen as an autonomous individual, the student should not be seen as Atlas carrying the weight of the world on his shoulders. This paper is an attempt to lighten that load. Available to the student should be tutoring and support services enough to not only lighten the burden, but to encourage that not all of it has to be carried by one's self.

Most H.E.O.P. Programs allow for tutorial services for the student. Many colleges, such as Mercy College, provide a College Skills division which is meant to be the arm of education that helps the student. The question of the means of selecting a tutor and the function of a tutorial unit, as opposed to teaching, is the basis of this paper.

Teaching vs. Tutoring

It would be impossible to fully define what teaching is in this brief paper. It might better suit this paper to operationally define teaching by looking at the "Five Processes of Teaching" as detailed by Joyce and Harootunian (1967). These processes are:

1) Making and Using Knowledge

   Knowledge is seen as methods and concepts of organizing life's experiences. The teacher does not give data alone, but gives data for the purpose of generalizing and inquiring.

2) Shaping the School

   The teacher is the developer of strategies to identify critical educational problems and to make decisions towards solving them. This includes the development of behavioral objectives that will define when learning has taken place.

3) Teaching with Strategy

   Communication and teaching is seen as varied among many styles that are both uniquely effective as well as collectively effective. This means that appropriate methods and materials are tried, reviewed, and altered when necessary.

4) Creating Interpersonal Climates

   Here the teacher works in and out of many groups and roles. There is a variance of behavior when working with students, colleagues, and administration. Furthermore, it implies a self-awareness to be able to stimulate leadership and cooperation.

5) Controlling a Teaching Personality

   The self-awareness is continued as personal values and beliefs get challenged as students try to experiment with standards and authority.

Although both instructor and tutor convey information from the content area of study, there is obviously a great difference between their actions. Using these five processes, both the second and third steps are inapplicable to the tutor. Steps one, four,

and five apply to both and then ostensibly the student is seen as the recipient. A closer look examines the disparities.

The student often takes the passive role in learning and views the teacher as the disseminator of facts, as the possessor of wisdom to be shared. The content is new to the student and often unclear even after having some familiarity with the material by having read a chapter or two in the textbook. The tutor does not have the same position in the eyes of the student.

The tutor is seen differently and is not necessarily regarded as a professional. The tutor is most often seen as one who has undergone the same trials and tribulations and has gained some degree of mastery. Often, this is the basis of selection of the tutor or Big Brother/Big Sister. The tutor is seen as the positive role model that the student can emulate. It is almost as if the tutor was selected to read the line "If I can do it, you can do it too!"

The tutor's job is often one of clarifying and re-interpreting already presented material. This means that some familiarity, albeit usually without understanding, exists. The terms to be learned have already been exposed and the tutor now has to re-interpret for the student or must identify the obstacle that doesn't allow comprehension and use of the material.

In the College Opportunity Program at Mercy College the peer tutor is greatly depended upon during the summer when an intensive, six-week program initiates freshmen to the college. The peer counselor/tutor actually attends the same classes the freshmen have. It is then possible for them to give "consecutive translation" to the student who thinks the instructor was speaking in Greek. This "translation" and re-teaching is not needed continually, nor does every student require it.

It is important that it be highlighted here that the tutor is not teaching. Teaching has already taken place. The tutor is addressing a singular need and is re-clarifying and rephrasing. This is a talent separate and distinct from teaching.

Demands

Again, the teacher is providing data for generalizing and inquiring. This is what McClelland (1974) suggests by teaching not for "intelligence," but for competence. So if the end-product of learning is utilization of information, it is logical that assignments are made by the instructor not only to enhance the learning process by review, but also to show practical use for this information. These homework assignments as part of the class requirements and, as such, the student is accountable to the instructor for them.

The tutor cannot make demands of this nature because the student is not accountable in a like manner. The tutor cannot give work outside the hour conference unless the student is committed enough to assume that much more of the extra responsibility. Often it is the tutor who sees the specific need of the student during the one-to-one meeting. But the tutor finds himself in a precarious position: he cannot extend the learning via exercise as the instructor does. The student wants to be able to complete the assignment, not find more to do.

For this reason, weekly meetings are held in the C.O.P. with academic advisor, instructional staff, and tutors. These meetings have a extremely high yield as information of this nature is shared. The common ground is the intention to help the student. Here, the tutor may provide the teacher with a better route to "reach" the student.

These meetings concern not only the reading class, but also the writing class, content courses, freshman orientation, and general concerns of the student. Seven assumptions about the learning process have come from these meetings.

1) Pupils vary in the amount of time and practice needed to accomplish a given task. This means that further extension exercises should be made available by the teacher for the tutor to use. Yet it also means that the teacher must acknowledge that these exercises are a part of the class requirements.
2) From this acknowledgement by the teacher there is the greater implication that individual differences can be met. The student can be seen as working at his own pace with enough time to take the practice that is necessary before advancement to the next developmental stage or unit.
3) The teacher's involvement in the tutorial program can alternate between direct and indirect intervention. A successful tutor would be one that requires little teacher instruction, but active teacher involvement and commitment to the tutorial aspect.
4) Because the student is in a group learning experience, it is often the case that a new unit will be started before complete mastery of an old one is achieved. It is understood that the tutor will attempt to bridge the gap and bring the student up to class standards as soon as possible.

5) If this bridging is to take place, both tutor and teacher are to share in a constant evaluation of the progress of the student. Here, the teacher can suggest new strategies for the tutor.
6) The instructor is most effective when teaching is not limited to the classroom. Working with the tutorial group or individual, whether directly or indirectly, adds to the efficiency of learning and the economy of the contact hour.
7) The student is a product of andragogy and is to be encouraged to be an active learner. Responsibility is not seen as a burden, but as a tool for managing a course of study. If the "community" is built upon, this responsibility will include helping fellow classmates and allows the student to sometimes slip into the role of tutor. Thus, learning is enhanced if students help each other and are supportive of each other.

Motivation

Under what circumstances does the student meet the instructor and tutor? It is apparent that the student goes to class for credit towards graduation. The student may be taking a course by choice or to fulfill a requirement. Do all students actually carefully select the instructor, or is the instructor somebody the student first comes to meet on opening day?

There is something to be said against the famous instructor TBA (to be announced). The student not only has the right as consumer to know who will be in front of the class, but also should have the freedom to choose.

It is conceivable that the student may have failed the course once and may now want a fresh start with someone new. It may also be a matter of two personalities clashing. It is also often the case that a particular instructor gets assigned to a course because of an area of expertise. Is this the same instructor the student will face after failing the course the first time? What preconceived notions would the student have?

The tutor is necessary to act as the pressure valve for the student. No matter what person is in front of the class, the tutor is there to rephrase the lesson and/or re-channel emotions that might be blocking learning.

Still, the area of compatibility is easier to deal with when compared with how the student meets the tutor. Peer tutors are carefully selected for "rigid flexibility." They rigidly adhere to the goals of the H.E.O.P. Program, but are flexible to work with different styles of teaching and learning. Often the tutor is sought by the student because a need is recognized. The matter of whether the class is an elective or requirement is irrevelant. The matter is one of having to pass.

In this light the tutor is viewed by some as a beacon of hope. One tutor may be known for his/her particular body of expertise. Another is possibly known for his/her style of work. The student may approach the hour conference with the tutor with every anticipation of revelation and vision <u>deus ex machina</u>. The student may be assigned a tutor, or may find one, who is compatible in method of working as well as in personality. The student has much greater choice in the selection of a tutor than in the selection of an instructor.

Commitment on the student's part may be tangibly greater when the fee for the tutor must come from the student's budget. Sometimes a few personal sacrifices are made in order to get the benefit of understanding.

Affective Teaching

For many teachers and instructors in an Open Enrollment or H.E.O.P. setting personal self-introspection is a greatly needed experience. The socio-economic differences between instructor and tutor are great. Identification is easier with the latter. Personal values and beliefs are often subtly communicated more in body language and expression than in words. Here the tutor has a clear advantage.

The student often views the tutor in a more positive light. Trust and faith is something the teacher must work much harder to get. Caring and sincerity are like respect; they are earned, not demanded. Some teachers are poor communictors in this area. The mask of their role often impedes the inner warmth. This is not to say that the feeling is not there, just that it is harder for the student to perceive. There are other instructors who, no matter what they do, will always be perceived as being caring people who have great faith in the student. Often reputation (real or imaginary) precedes the first day of class. The tutor has an easier time of gaining this bond of rapport because he/she is seen as being more like the student, again as one who has gone through the same trials and tribulations.

Cultural evaluation by the teacher can act as as a block to the affective domain of the student. While rejecting the cultural background or "street savvy" of the student, the teacher is casting out a personal rejection of the student. Often inclusion of, or

reference to, the seemingly more "real" world of the student is a means of openning the door to the student. The teacher must make as much effort to be a part of the student's world as the student must strive towards being a part of the greater world. Here, again, the tutor has the advantage as being an official member of both worlds.

Feelings are reinforced outside the classroom by members of the peer group and family. The teacher has limited time of contact. Why improve language communication skills in English when the language spoken at home is Arabic? English becomes that "other" language, a sister to "pig Latin." The tutor helps in this area by establishing the utility of the content to be studied. Again, the tutor is seen as the bridge of both worlds.

Contact

Contact may be viewed in terms of time, as above, or in terms of influence. The teacher/instructor has often been referred to in jest as the frustrated actor or performer. To a certain degree the instructor is "on stage" in the sense that one has to captivate the "audience." Personality, charm, and means of communication hold the students' interest. The instructor is not an entertainer, but must relate well to the class. There must be a sense of timing - when to quicken or slower the pace. There is an instinct for the time to insert the joke.

The teacher stands before the mass and, although may attempt to include students by seeking out participation, finds that attention to any one student or singular need is an impossibility. The classroom, lab, or lecture hall becomes an arena of learning and the center of group activity.

The point is that singular needs cannot be addressed. For

individual consideration the tutor is needed. One-to-one contact can be much less anxiety provoking when rapport has been established. The fear of failure or embarrassment before peers is abated.

The tutor can finesse the student in the sense that with time and questions one can fine-tune the points previously taught by the instructor. What may seem trivial to the student and, therefore, not worthy of being asked within the classroom, can now be comfortably brought to light, questioned, and tested.

Conclusion

The instructor and tutor are seen in different lights. Their jobs and complementary, but most efficiently carried out when they work with each other. Feedback to both is essential for their common goal: support in structuring the adult learning environment.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Dropkin, Stan, Harold Full, and Ernest Schwarcz
Contemporary American Education
Toronto: MacMillan; 1965

Frankel, Alan and William Lindsey
"Structuring An Adult Learning Environment"
paper presented for New York College
Learning Skills Association; April 1981 (ERIC)

Gartner, Alan, Colin Greer, and Frank Riessman
The New Assault on Equality
New York: Harper and Row; 1974

Joyce, Bruce R. and Berj Harootunian
The Structure of Teaching
Chicago: SRA; 1967

Kidd, J. R.
How Adults Learn
New York: Association Press; 1976

Postman, Neil
Teaching As A Conserving Activity
New York: Delacorte Press; 1979